

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/680,858	Applicant(s) BEETHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner David H Kruse	Art Unit 1638	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David H Kruse & Amy Nelson.

(3) Keith Walker.

(2) John Sanders.

(4) Peter Beetham.

Date of Interview: 11 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 24 and 28-32.

Identification of prior art discussed: Fennell et al and Kmiec '181 US patent and Hawkes WO patent application.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The outstanding issue of written description as directed to all of the pending claims and the issues of the prior art as directed to a mutated plant microspore at claims 30-32 were discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required